(17(10) 1987 are 404.1, 409.3, 423.3 and 457.3 respectively.

(b) To contain the prices of vegetables NAFEED at the instance of Ministry of Civil Supplies and Ministry of Agriculture started supplying OnionlPotato from 20th July, onwards to the Government nominated agencies for retail distribution through their marketing channels. Also State Governments have been advisee to set up and activate Price Surveillance and Monitoring Committees at the State(Dis-ib-Divisional level with the help of "s participation.

Allotment of land for farmers' parliamentary forum building

100. SHRI F. M. KHAN; Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state;

(a) whether it is a fact that the Farmers* Parliamentary Forum had recently requested for allotment of a piece of land on Mandir Marg for its office building;

whether it is also a fact that the request of the Forum has been turned down on the plea that the land asked for was on the Ridge and not on the Mandir Marg;

(c) whether the land in question is in the same line and in continuation of vari ous Institutional buildings such as Hindu Maha Sabha Bhavan, Madras Club, Birla Mandir, Kali Bari and a number of schools etc.;

(d) whether a number of M.Ps. have themselves seen the land and have confir-med and written to the Minister in 'this regard; and

(e) if so. wheher Government propose to verify the posi!ion and allot the land to the Forum?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRT DALBIR SINGH); (a) and (b) Yes.

(c) Land in question i_s in the same line and in continuation of various institutional buildings. These institutions wees allotted land prior to the decision, not to dis-turb the ridge area which includes Mandir iMarg Area also.

(d) Only representation from Shri Hari-kishan Shastri, MP was received in Nov. 86 stating that the land in question doos not. form part of the ridge.

(e) I_n view of the reply to points (a) to (d) above, it may not be possible to allot land t_0 the Forum on Mandir Marg Area as it now forms par; of the ridge.

Vacation of Government accommodation in DIZ area from retired Government employees

101. SHRI J. P. GOYAL; Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that several Go vernment employees who had retired from Government service a year back are still occupying the quarters allotted to them while they were in Government service cither on false medical certificates or in collusion of the officers of the Estate Office especially in Sector 'D\ DIZ area;

(b) if so, what are the particulars of such Government employees who have been living there after the stipulated period of four months from their retirement from Government, service; and.

(c) what action Government propose to take in this regard and by when such accommodation is likely to be get vaca-ted and allotted to others in the waiting list?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE (MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI'DALBIR SINGH); (a) No.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

Commercial plots purchased by builders from DDA

102. SHRI J.P. GOYAL; Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state;

(a) whether it is a fact that several builders owe crores of rupees to the Delhi

Development Authority for the commercial plots they purchased from the UDA years ago;

(b) if so. what are the names of such builders and the amount outstanding against each such builder;

(c) what action has so far been taken by the DDA to recover the amount with interest from these builders; and

(d) what further action is contemplated against these builders?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) and (b) Twelve builders as per statement annexed *(Sec* below) had purchased commercial plots from DDA through auctions and as per terms & conditions of the sate they had deposited 25 per-cent of amount with DDA and failed to deposit the 75 per cent of the bid amount within prescribed period. In -some of these eases directions were issued by the Govt. to deposit the balance amount with penalty charges but the purchasers (auctioneer failed to comply with the requirement-;.

(c) and (d) Their cases are under consideration of DDA and appropriate action will be taken on each case on merit.

Statement

List of the Bidders who purchased DDA's commercial plots hut did not pay the cost thereof

SI. No.	Name of the Builder	Amount due
		Rs.
1	M's. Ansal Properties & Ind. (P) Ltd.	7,84,19,938
2	M/s. Anand Construction Co. (P) Ltd.	1.26,75,000
3	M/s. Delhi Tower (P) Ltd.	2,35,59,000
4	M/s. Bhatia Constn. Corporation	2,39,25.000
5	M/s. Ruch Estates Builders	99,75,00
6	M/s. RadhuTheatres (P)Ltd."	1,35,07,500
7	M/s. Skipper Tower (P) Ltd.	51,45,738
8	M/s. M.G. Builders *& Co.* (P) Ltd.	21,78,750
9	M/s. Kailsh Nath *&* Associates .	2,34,00,000
10	M's. Competent Builders	64,57,500
11	SAS Bhatia	7,86,001
12	Skipper Cortsta. (P) Ltd.	3,93,75,000